Special Issue on the War Crisis

If Cuba Is To Disarm, It Should Be Guaranteed Against U.S. Aggression and Interference

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 39 OCTOBER 29, 1962 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Time for Plain Words

After hearing the President and then listening in on the Security Council meeting in New York, I set down in despair —for how find words to match the magnitude of the crisis?— some basic observations on the events of the past few days:

1. Our blockade of Cuba, though called a quarantine and as yet limited, is an act of war. To throw a naval cordon around an island country, to arrogate to oneself the right to determine what supplies may reach it, to threaten stronger measures unless one's terms are met, is aggression.

2. We are asking a small neighboring country to dismantle what we claim are missile bases. But we make no offer in return to guarantee it against attack, to put a stop to hostile activity against it. Instead we have made it plain that we will not negotiate with Cuba's government but seek its overthrow. This is asking the unilateral disarmament of an intended victim.

No Defense Against Us

3. The type of arms we regard as defensive, the kind described by Mr. Kennedy in earlier press conferences, are the kind which could cope only with a small scale invasion by Cuban exiles, like that staged in April, 1961. The weapons we object to now—missiles, MIGs, Ilyushin bombers—are the kind of weapons with which the Cubans could hope, though only for a short while, to fight off an American attack. In this sense, they are defensive, and in this sense we are asking the Cubans to give up the only type of weapons big enough to cope with an American attack.

4. Exactly what weapons the Cubans have is far from clear. What is clear is that no possible scale of armament for a people of 6,500,000 could make it feasible for that nation to take offensive action against a nation of 180,000,000 people, especially one with the greatest arsenal of destructive power in all human history. In that sense, whatever weapons the Cubans have, are defensive.

5. All the Cubans could hope to do with a few nuclear weapons—if they had them—would be to deter an American attack by the threat of retaliation. The threat wouldn't mean much because we could knock out the whole island—and its bases—with one nuclear blow. But in all objectivity, isn't this the doctrine of deterrence which we popularized?

6. Do the Cubans have such means of deterrence? This is not clear. Apparently we have spotted 24 surface-to-air missile sites, 22 of them operational, in Cuba. Surface-to-air missiles are short range and we regard them as defensive. In addition we claim to have spotted sites for 1,000 mile mobile missiles and seen such missiles on trailers. "Additional sites not yet completed," the President said, "appear to be designed for intermediate range ballistic missiles capable of travelling more than twice that far. . . ." We do not claim that such missiles have been put in place nor do we claim to have evidence that there are nuclear warheads in Cuba. On the other hand while Mr. Zorin at the United Nations Tuesday night did attack "the completely false and slanderous thesis of the presence of *offensive* Soviet rockets in Cuba" (our italics) he did not deny that missiles had been sent Cuba. Nor did Mr. Garcia-Inchastegui, the Cuban Ambassador to the UN. Indeed his reply implied that Cuba had such rockets.

Another Warning by Ike Few Will Heed

". . . a united America need not and should not degenerate into a conformist, a silenced America. In our internal affairs, unity should not become an excuse for compliant submission . . . our civic duties impel us to express our honest convictions. . . . The Republic of the United States—the oldest Constitutional government among the major nations of the world—has survived war and the peril of war because the American people through their elected representatives in the Congress have always been free to advise and counsel—even to rebuke and warn—the Executive. Therein lies the fundamental strength of our system. Never has catastrophe nor emergency justified reduction of the people to a regimented herd or of their representatives to blind acceptance of decree and pronouncement by government."

—Former President Eisenhower, Oct. 24.

"Good" Missiles and "Bad" Missiles

7. The Cuban Ambassador's defense of this would be hard to answer in any impartial court. He told the Security Council:

The North American President said . . . that our defensive arms affect the security of their territory. I appeal to the conscience of this Council: Are not the military potential and the aggressions of the North Americans a threat to our people? . . . Their idea is that the U.S., as a military power, as a developed country, can promote, stimulate, and carry out all types of aggressions, boycotts, sabotage, and all acts contrary to international law—and Cuba, a small but nevertheless courageous country, cannot arm in its own defense. . . . If we proceed along that line, there will be no sovereignty left unscathed, and only the law of the strongest will prevail in relations between States. . . . According to the statements made by the representative of the United States, there are two types of military bases and two types of rockets: the good military bases and the bad ones, the good rockets and the bad ones. And obviously the government of the United States reserves the right to determine when a rocket is good and when a rocket is naughty, when a base is good and when a base is naughty.

8. While the Cuban desire for effective defense and deterrence is understandable, it is also natural that every American should be alarmed at the thought of waking up one morning to find a nuclear missile on our doorstep. The President was right when he said, "Nuclear weapons are so destructive and

(Continued on Page Two)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moscow Wouldn't Be Calm If We Secretly Put Missile Bases in Finland ...

ballistic missiles are so swift that any substantially increased possibility of their use or any sudden deployment may well be regarded as a definite threat to the peace." But this sudden possibility of nuclear missiles in the Caribbean should enable us to see how it looked from the other side when we began deploying intermediate range missiles in Turkey, Italy, and Britain aimed at Russia and on Okinawa aimed at China. Here again we come up suddenly against the double standards we have employed.

The Puzzling Absence of Camouflage

9. Mr. Kennedy said, "For many years both the Soviet Union and the United States, recognizing this fact, have deployed strategic nuclear weapons with great care, never upsetting the precarious status quo which insured that these interests would not be used in the absence of some vital challenge." The fact is that the Soviets, unlike ourselves, have hitherto never deployed strategic missiles outside their borders. It is we who have done so, though keeping control with our own military technicians (as perhaps the Russians may be doing in Cuba). Indeed I must confess to some skepticism about IRBM's in Cuba in view of Russian reluctance to place them in any satellites and the fact that Soviet diplomats have not regarded Castro as too dependable. Could we be up against a feint and a ploy? Why the absence of camouflage?

10. If the Russians are in process of placing IRBM's in Cuba, then Mr. Kennedy is justified in accusing them of bad faith. The semantics of what constitutes a defensive and what an offensive weapon may be put to one side. But it is true that when the Soviet statement of Sept. 11 said that Russia's rockets were so powerful she had "no need to search for sites for them beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union," this implied in the context of the Russo-American dialogue on Cuba that they were not going to place nuclear missiles on the island. The neutrals trying to mediate this conflict need only stop and consider what Khrushchev would have said if Kennedy secretly had begun building IRBMs in Yugoslavia and Finland after declaring publicly that the U.S. was only sending them defensive weapons!

11. Here we come to the inner heart of this conflict which threatens the world. Mr. Kennedy saw this as a personal affront, a challenge to his leadership and a blow at American prestige. "This sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil," Mr. Kennedy said, "is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this

Women's Strike Statement

"We women who have dedicated ourselves to preserving and cherishing human life are concerned that the present Cuban crisis may erupt into nuclear war.

We, together with President Kennedy, have committed ourselves to accomplishing world peace by general disarmament under effective United Nations control. We feel that the settlement of the Cuban crisis under United Nations auspices is an essential step towards ultimate disarmament and world order. The quarantine of vessels announced by the President is, we believe, a serious threat of the use of force in violation of the charters of the United Nations and the Organization of American States. Moreover, it establishes a precedent of unilateral action that may be used to the detriment of world peace in other situations.

Therefore, we respectfully urge our President to reconsider the announced action to quarantine the seas pending an orderly determination of the differences between the United States, the Soviet Union and Cuba by the United Nations. We call upon both sides to use restraint in this critical situation and to use extraordinary caution to assure that a nuclear disaster does not result either by accident or reckless action."

—Women Strike For Peace, Oct. 22.

An Appeal to The President to Lift The Blockade and Neutralize Cuba

"In response to President Kennedy's address on the dangerous turn Cuban-American relations have taken in the past few days, we feel obligated, as private citizens, to urge a sense of restraint and reflection upon our government and our fellow-citizens.

"We believe, first, that the President's order of a partial naval blockade on Cuba is an unwise move and one which clearly threatens the peace of both the Caribbean and the world. We believe too at this grave hour threats of force and coercion serve only to exacerbate rather than to calm this serious crisis. Such threats, in violation of our commitment to the UN Charter and the OAS Statute, fail to increase our own security while frustrating the very policy aims they pretend to serve. They are, in every sense, indefensible.

"As we now wait through this grave crisis we wish to remind the leaders of both our own nation and that of the Soviet Union of the dangers inherent in using the destinies of small states to serve their own ends. The Soviet Union and the United States must realize that the existence of nuclear weapons on each other's borders threatens their own security as well as the well-being of all the world's peoples. In our world threats of force are acts of suicide. In the midst of such intense crises the possibilities of war by accident and miscalculation, always serious, are multiplied a thousand-fold, while minor irritants take on the air of grave and novel provocations.

"Let the great powers resolve now to withdraw their nuclear weapons to their own borders as a first step toward meaningful general disarmament.

"We call upon the Soviet Union to cease now all further arms shipments of any kind to Cuba.

"We call upon the United States to end both its new blockade and the old embargo directed at Cuba and to move as well to normalize relations with the present Cuban government. We call upon the Cuban Government to declare itself a neutral state and to place itself under the protection of the General Assembly.

"We call upon the political leaders in our own country to respect the wishes of our people, as indicated in so many recent reports, and to reflect in word and deed their desire for reduction of Cuban-American tensions.

"Finally, we call upon the Soviet Union and the United States to use the immense resources now consumed by the weapons of war to contribute to the well-being of the impoverished masses of the under-developed world.

"In short, let the leaders and the peoples of the great powers—TURN TOWARD PEACE."

Alfred Hassler; Charles Lawrence; Homer Jack; Robert Gilmore; Seymour Melman; Norman Thomas; Carey McWilliams; A. J. Muste; Donald Keys; John McDermott; and I. F. Stone.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . India and China Proving Even More Irresponsible Than U.S. and U.S.S.R.

country if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again, by either friend or foe." Mr. Kennedy saw this as a dare from Mr. Khrushchev, a test of nerve.

The Puerility That May Doom Our Species

12. This "double-dare-you" aspect of the crisis may seem puerile, but it is this puerility which may spell doom for our species. While the world's two most powerful nations are on the brink of war, its two most populous countries are already at war—from just such motivations. If we set the Russo-American conflict beside the Sino-Indian war, as if they were a set of simultaneous equations, we will begin to see the real nature of the situation in which man is trapped. India and China are at war over uninhabitable high mountain lands on their far western frontier and over malarial equally uninhabitable jungle lands on their easternmost frontier. The prestige of the leadership on both sides is at stake in this wholly idiotic conflict; Nehru and Menon would be attacked as appeasers if they gave in; presumably similar fears haunt the Chinese leaders. Then, on both sides, the symbol, the sacred symbol of the nation, commands a devotion so deep that millions who have only the faintest idea of where the disputed lands lie, are ready to die for "the sacred soil." In the East as in the West, the Nation commands the fanatic allegiance men once gave to their gods. Finally, just as Nehru and Mao are unconcerned with the effect on the rest of the world, so are we. Though our Cuban policy risks thermonuclear war—and Khrushchev's Cuban policy has also risked thermonuclear war—and though this war would involve all mankind directly or indirectly, we move toward it without consulting even our closest allies. These are, as the phrase goes, informed but not consulted.

13. The Sino-Indian dispute does not bother the world so much because neither has nuclear weapons. But if they did have them, they have given us no reason to believe that concern for the fallout on other peoples would prevent them from bombing each other. We are not the only country with a "Cuba." The only difference is that we are big enough to be a law unto ourselves. The British and French, in attacking at Suez, felt that their vital interests were at stake, that to allow Nasser to get away with seizure of the canal was to weaken their prestige irreparably. In other words, they felt about Egypt exactly as our sugar and oil companies feel about Cuba. If they had been strong enough to act independently of the U.S., if they had not been threatened by the Soviet Union, they would have gone ahead at no matter what cost to the rest of the world. So it was with the Dutch in their quarrel with Indonesia and the Portuguese when the Indians took

(Continued on Page Four)

French Cynical

"PARIS, Oct. 23 (Tuesday) — The arms embargo threatened against Cuba by the United States announced by President Kennedy tonight was met in Paris with official silence. . . . Some opinion was expressed here before President Kennedy's speech, and it was hardly flattering for American policy.

"Waverly Root, of The Washington Post Foreign Service reported every broadcast, without exception, which was heard last night, plus published and word of mouth comment, attributed whatever action the United States government intends to take to electoral considerations. It has been explained endlessly to French listeners that the administration, finding itself under criticism from its Republican opposition for lack of success in meeting the Cuban issue, is now out to prove itself tougher than its critics."

—The Washington Post, Oct. 23.

First British Press Reactions Mostly Critical of Kennedy's Cuba "Quarantine"

"The Daily Herald argues that, even if such Soviet bases as those described by President Kennedy do exist on Cuba, a report should have been made to the Security Council before the United States risked "such incalculable consequences." The Daily Telegraph, while expressing sympathy with the United States, is fearful of the complications which might result from the measures being taken by the US, and also suggests it might have been better for the US to state its case at the United Nations before taking such action. The Daily Express fully supports the United States' action, while the Daily Worker calls it 'a flagrant action of aggression'." *—Coup d'Oeil, UN, Oct. 23.*

THE GUARDIAN (Liberal) refers to the possibility of a blockade and asks how a blockade of Cuba is likely to be taken in Moscow and how will it effect the rest of the world? The paper says the Soviet Union might consider that if the United States thinks itself entitled to blockade a Communist base close to its home territory, then Soviet ships or planes are equally entitled to cordon off in some way western bases in Turkey or the Soviet Union might put heavy pressure on Western communications with Berlin. THE GUARDIAN continues:

"Either way we could expect a dangerous crisis. In the United Nations the United States will have to justify any such action as a blockade. But how? How can the Administration justify even such limited military action? There is, at the moment, no shred of an excuse which the rest of the world could accept, and no sign of one. ..Cuba is not invading anyone. Even it it has offensive weapons, their presence in bases elsewhere has justified no such drastic action. It is hard to see how America can act, except on grounds of mistaken self-interest. A blockade so instituted would do America's cause, her friends, and her true interests serious harm, for no worthwhile purpose."

The DAILY MAIL (Conservative) says "two flash points on opposite sides of the world threaten peace, and, for once, the quarrelsome Europeans—in whom we include the British—are not mixed up with either. Instead, Indians are fighting Chinese in the East, and a menacing situation has arisen between Americans and Cubans in the West. The paper says that if, as the Americans say, there are missile bases in Cuba, this is a dire threat to the United States, but they must have known about them for a long time. Are they now to be used as an excuse for action against Cuba? Has President Kennedy partly surrendered to anti-Cuban hysteria?" The DAILY MAIL says:

"We cannot help thinking that any hostile move against Cuba is a profound mistake. It is certain to arouse antagonisms, especially throughout Latin America. It would have been wiser to have met Russian penetration with aid . . . and with friendship rather than antagonism."

—British Information Services, Oct. 23.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adlai Talks of Pluralism But Won't Recognize Cuba; Zorin's Pot-and-Kettle Arguments

Sane Solution: A Neutralized Cuba and Resumption of U.S. Relations With It

Goa. A world organized in this irrational and lawless fashion is a world bound sooner or later to destroy itself.

14. Against this background, the speeches of both Stevenson and Zorin to the Security Council Tuesday night were equally nauseating. Stevenson's was a stale Phillipic in the Truman-Acheson tradition. It beat the drums for a new holy war. The cold war, Stevenson said, "isn't a private struggle; it is a world civil war—a contest between the pluralistic world and the monolithic world. . . ." This is one of those propagandistic half truths which breed war and block conciliation. How "pluralistic" is a government which will not negotiate with a small neighbor because it does not like that neighbor's form of government? On the other hand the argument took on familiar pot-and-kettle lineaments when Zorin accused the U.S. of "saber rattling"—presumably he spoke of sabers because it is the USSR which in recent years has done the *rocket* rattling—and when he spoke of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states. No nation honors the principle less than Moscow. There would be no conflict between the U.S. and Cuba, for example, if Cuba were as willing to accept U.S. limits on her freedom of action as Finland is to accept Russia's.

Canada Cool to Blockade

"It was worth noting, however, that neither the Prime Minister nor Opposition leaders said anything suggesting that Canada cut off her trade with Cuba or join any possible blockade or military action that might follow."

—New York Times, Oct. 23 (Ottawa Dispatch)

15. Theoretically, a solution to the Cuban crisis should not be unattainable. The Cuban Ambassador opened his speech to the Security Council by quoting again from the declaration the Cuban Council of Ministers adopted in response to our Congressional Joint Resolution on Cuba. "Were the United States able," Mr. Garcia-Inchaustegui read to the Security Council from that Cuban document, "to give Cuba effective guarantees and satisfactory proof concerning the integrity of Cuban territory, and were it to cease its subversive and counter-revolutionary activities against our people, then Cuba would not have to strengthen its defenses. Cuba would not even need an army, and all the resources that are used for this could be gratefully and happily invested in the economic and cultural development of the country." A sane solution would be to neutralize the island, to withdraw missiles and Guantanamo together. Mr. Kennedy said in his speech that we were prepared to "discuss new proposals for the removal of tensions on both sides, including the possibilities of a genuinely independent Cuba free to determine its own destinies." (But Cuba can only be independent if the U.S. resumes trade relations with it.) The Soviet resolution before the Security Council "calls on the United States of America, upon the Republic of Cuba and upon the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to enter into negotiations for the purpose of normalizing the situation and thereby of removing the threat of war." Surely within the context of these three positions, a solution is possible, honorable and satisfactory to all?

One Latin Protest

"U. S. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon said he would remain here until Tuesday afternoon to deliver the main U. S. speech at the week-long conference. But he said he would fly to Washington immediately after his talk.

"This decision drew the fire of Henrique Vale, deputy chief of the Brazilian delegation, who said: 'Cuba clearly is of immense strategic concern to the United States. But the alliance which is to build the future of all our countries should get every priority and not get mixed up with other, more temporary issues'."

—Washington Post from Mexico City, Oct. 23.

16. Practically, however, I fear that the momentum of events is passing beyond control, that an invasion of Cuba may already be in the works, that though the Soviet Union holds back from action, we shall plunge ahead, and if the shooting once starts, the conflict and its consequences will not easily be contained. *Oct. 24*

Now's the Time to Redouble Efforts for the Peace Candidates, Especially Hughes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/29/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED